1 (08 00) 0 65

E			Application	Number	09/991,9	900							
TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Filing Date First Named Inventor Group Art Unit		November 23, 2001 Gokhale 2171								
										Examiner Na	me	Te Chen	
							Total Number of Pages in This Submission		1 1/	Attorney Docket Number		4982/23	
		ENCLO	SURES (check	all that apply)									
Fee Transmittal Form		Assignment Papers (for an Application)		After Allowance Communication Group									
Fee Attached		☐ Drawing(s)			al Communication to Boar als and Interferences								
Response to Examiner Interview		Declaration for Utility or Design Patent Application			al Communication to Grou al Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)								
After Final		and Ac	Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition		Propr	ietary Information							
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		☐ Status	s Letter								
Extension of Time Request		Power of Attorney			r Enclosure(s) e identify below):								
Express Abandonment Request		☐ Terminal Disclaimer		- r	eturn receipt postcard								
		Request for Refund											
☐ Information Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)											
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks Customer N			o 2985	58							
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application													
 	SIGNA	TURE OF	APPLICANT, A	TTORNEY, O	R AGENT								
Firm <i>or</i> Individual name	Pristine Johannessen, Reg. No. 55,302												
Signature	Phone mus												
Date December 16, 2004													
		CEI	RTIFICATE OF	MAILING '									
I hereby certify that the	is correspondence i	s being depo	sited with the Uni	ted States Posta	al Service as	s first class mail in an enve							
addressed to: Commi	ssioner for Patents	P.O. Box 14	50, Alexandria, V	'A 22313-1450 o	n this date:	December 16, 2004							
Typed or printed name	Pristine Joha	nnessen											
Signature		momen			Date	December 16, 2004							

BRMFS1 545917v1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

e Application of

Parag GOKHALE et al.

Appln. No.

09/991,900

Examiner:

Te CHEN

Filing Date

November 23, 2001

Art Unit:

2171

Title

METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SCHEDULING MEDIA EXPORTS

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

This paper is filed further to the Request for Continued Examination filed September 10, 2004, the interview with Examiner held November 16, 2004, and the Office Action dated June 3, 2004.

Statement of the substance of the interview begins on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 7 of this paper.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.133(b), the Applicants submit the following summary of the substance of the interview with Examiner held November 16, 2004.

The Applicants' representatives, Seth Ostrow and Marcus Muller, explained the invention and its differences from the prior art including U.S. Patent No. 5,764,972 to Crouse et al. ("Crouse"). Mr. Ostrow and Mr. Muller explained that "exporting" and "library" are specific terms that are well-known in the art and which differ from "mounting" with respect to magnetic media as used in Crouse and from file libraries generally. The Examiner indicated that she understood "export" to not include removing media from a storage device and further suggested that she understood exporting and importing media to be similar to uploading and downloading files from the Internet or other network. Mr. Muller respectfully disagreed citing support to the contrary in claim 1 indicating that media is exported "from the library" and further reiterating that "exporting" is well-known and understood in the art to include removing media from a storage device.

The Examiner requested clarification regarding how a "library" according to the invention differs from an electronic library, clarification regarding how a "second time" relates to a "first time" in claim 1, and also clarification of the term "media" as used in claim 1. The Examiner also requested additional information distinguishing "export" from "mount" since she stated that she believed these were synonymous. The Examiner also indicated that she would perform an additional search for proper art more relevant to the claimed invention.